

From: Thom McConathy [mailto:thomm@pacifier.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2006 7:15 PM
To: Howard, Dave
Subject: Fw: Phase II NPDES

Could you forward this to the right person for me?

Thanks----- Original Message -----

From: Thom McConathy
To: Comments@ecy.wa.gov
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2006 12:31 PM
Subject: Phase II NPDES

To: Department of Ecology
Water Quality Program
Municipal Stormwater Permits

From: Thom McConathy of Clark County Water Quality Resource Council
1017 NE 107 street
Vancouver WA 98685

RE: Responses to Phase II NPDES Stormwater

S1 page 1

There is a need to define the length of this permit, Many references are made with regard to timing that require this. The failure of DOT to renew this permit in a timely way has resulted in lower expectations of permittees and less building and subsequent water quality improvements that would have occurred had this been renewed six years ago. Yes we have lost many opportunities to stop degradation and improve already degraded waters because of DOE's incompetence.

S5,C,1, a all page 13 and 14 Public Education and outreach

This effort is indeed minimum. This effort should be directly linked to the problems that are limiting beneficial uses in the community. To as this section would allow/promote issues that are not directly linked to the highest priority water quality problems in the community is a waste of resources and will lead the community toward cynicism of DOE and the permittees program. Selecting only two of these might be acceptable for a small municipality of 10 to 30 thousand but for cities of 31 to 60 thousand more requirements should be required and for cities of 61 to 100 thousand should be doing more still while cities of over 100 thousand should be doing all of these.

S5, B, 3 Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination.

We should not have to wait three years for the permittee to complete a non specified amount of there jurisdiction. (DOE made this same mistake with the last phase I permit)
We should instead require a program that systematically addresses 95 percent of the jurisdiction over the life of this permit with a schedule of how this will occur reported within the first year of the permit.

S5, C, 3, C, ii, all Page 17 and 18, line 8-19 of next page.

The field assessment called for in ii should also include either chemical assessment like the phase I permits or as an alternative possibly to include biological assessment.

S5, C, 3, f, Page 18 line 35, Training

The word "Appropriate" Needs to be objectively described/defined.

S5, C, 4, page 19, Controlling runoff

This 1 acre standard is unsupportable especially considering cities like Vancouver with populations in excess of 140 thousand. This could be progressive with small towns meeting this standard but as urban areas increase in size and density this standard should decrease to Phase I standards. This one acre standard is much lower than the 2500 foot threshold presently in place in Vancouver or the 2000 required by Clark County. This is not building this is destroying water quality.

S6, Line 13, SMP for secondary permittees

This should not wait till the very end of the permit. Some of these entities are quit large and have had large effects on local water quality.

S6, C, 2, a and b, Public involvement

This is to minimum to be meaningful and is not consistent with EPA guidelines on this element. There is a need for the permittee to respond to written comments and to show that they are giving them consideration. There is a need also for DOE to review the SWP for sufficiency and to also give consideration of this public record/comment.

S8, Monitoring

Some form of monitoring for base line should be required on each basin to be built upon in subsequent permits. DOE should consider a progressive response to monitoring where permittees with of ten to thirty thousand would have a minimal response but those with thirty one to sixty thousand would have more responsibilities and those 70 to 100 even more and those over 100 thousand would have to meet phase I requirements.

S9 page 36

This should be required in the following full calendar year of operation of the permit. Who knows when DOE will get its xxxx together and issue a permit. This is the only way that both DOE and citizens have of monitoring permittees and to needlessly delay this review benefits no one.